UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,821	08/20/2003	Jamey Graham	015358-006520US	7875

20350   7590   02/05/2009

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 November 2008*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: Arguments filed 11/12/2008.

This action is made Final.

2.   Claims 1-72 are pending in the case. Claims 70-72 are new claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
> composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor,
> subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-23, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to

non-statutory subject matter. The first process in 101 examinations is to determine whether a

claim recited eligible subject matter and falls within one of the four classes of invention. Claims 1-

23, 70reflect process claims but a process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a

particular apparatus) or (2) transform the underlying subject matter to a different state or thing *In*

re Bilski. In this case, the claims clearly do not recite a process of transformation and the claims

do not tie the process to another statutory class by reciting an apparatus (See also *Diamond v.*

Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, *Parker v . Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63 and

Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780). Therefore, the claims are rejected under the first test under

35 U.S.C 101 examination because the claims do not fall into one of the four classes of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness**

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
> at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
> subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
> was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966),

that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or
     nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under

35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to

the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was

made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35

U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   **Claims 1-3, 10-13,16,18-26, 33-36, 39, 41-49, 56-59, 62, 64-72 are rejected under 35**

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekaran et al. (hereinafter Rajasekaran) U.S.

Publication No. 20030024975 filed Nov. 15, 2001, in further view of Rothschild et al.

(hereinafter Rothschild) U.S. Patent No. 6766363 filed Aug. 31, 2000.

In regard to **Independent claim 1,** Rajasekaran teaches a computer-implement method of
accessing a portion of recorded information using a paper document, the method comprising:

- Receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers from a

   first set of identifiers printed on the paper document (See Para 0067 and 79).

   Rajasekaran teaches selecting object identifiers from physical objects (See also Table 1,

   page 10).

- Determining one or more time ranges based upon the one or more identifiers,

  each time range having a start time and an end time (See Para 62-63). Rajasekaran

  teaches reading a timestamp that can have a temporal event that occurs periodically or

  randomly. Rajasekaran teaches the timestamp can be read to facilitate the display of

  content related to the timestamp. Therefore, a timestamp can have a beginning or end

  time. For example, Rajasekaran teaches a user interface that allows a user to view a

  catalog with an index. The index can be searched by scanning for an ID on a label.

  Therefore, images can be stored in a folder or index based on timestamps and scanning

  an index for a picture with a beginning and end time can be performed (See Para 0090

  and 0095 -96). The timestamp label is read in from a paper medium via a barcode (See

  Para 0099).

Rajasekaran does not expressly teach:

- Determining portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or

  more time ranges, wherein a portion of recorded information corresponding to a time

  range comprises information from the recorded information occurring between the start

  time and end time associated with the time range.

Rothschild teaches a system that allows users to database and present a code to retrieve

content. With the code, the system can relate items of interest based on the code and present the

information to the user (See column 2, lines 1-25 and column 4, lines 1-27). Rothschild provides a

specific example of a system that reads a code (See column 8, lines 1-17) and the time range

corresponds to the recorded information between the start and end time of the content. Further

Rothschild teaches the user can link any associated information to the code by showing the times

closest to the times indicated by the user, as the user transmits the rough elapsed time estimate,

which is a range (See column 8, lines 36-56), (See also column 10, lines 15-67).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention, having the teachings of Rajasekaran and Rothschild in front of them, to modify the

Labels of Rajasekaran to point to or reference content with a time range. Rothschild suggests the

Combination to allow the user too quickly and easily access related items of content (See column

2, lines 25-42), as content from one part of a video is related to another part of the video since the

video is a series of images interrelated over a period of time.

 With respect to **dependent claim 2,** Rajasekaran teach the method wherein one or more time

ranges includes a first time range and determining portions of the recorded information comprises

determining at least one of information of the first type and information of the second type from

the recorded information occurring between the start time and end time associated with the first

time range. (See Para 0051-52).Rajasekaran teaches a method wherein the recorded information

comprises information of a first type and information of a second type and teaches that an index

of content items is organized by timestamp (See Para 0090). Rajasekaran teaches scanning an

index to look for objects (See Para 0096-0098) and the objects are identified by reading a

barcode off of paper (See Para 0099).

With respect to **dependent claim 3,** Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein the information of

the first type is video information and the information of the second type is at least one of audio

information and closed-caption text information (See Para 0074, media content can be in one or

more formats).

With respect to **dependent claim 10,** Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein the identifiers in

the first set of identifiers are barcodes (See Para 0021), and receiving information indicative of

selection of the one or more identifiers from the first set of identifiers comprises reading at least

one barcode from the paper document using a barcode reader (See Para 0044).

With respect to **dependent claim 11,** Rajasekaran teaches the method further comprising

receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers from a second set of

identifiers printed on the paper document (See Para 0038, 42 and 65) determining one or more

operations based upon the one or more identifiers selected from the second set of identifiers; and

performing at least one operation from the one or more operations on a portion of the recorded

information corresponding to at least one time range from the one or more time ranges (See Para

0079-81).

With respect to **dependent claim 12,** Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein performing the at

least one operation comprises outputting the portion of the recorded information corresponding to

the at least one time range from the one or more time ranges (See Para 0063 and 74 and 95-96).

With respect to **dependent claim 13,** Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein performing the at

least one operation comprises communicating the portion of the recorded information

corresponding to the at least one time range to a recipient (See Para 39).

With respect to **dependent claim 16,** Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein performing the at

least one operation comprises deleting the portion of the recorded information corresponding to

the at least one time range from the recorded information (See Para 54). Deleting a portion of the

tree that represents a tour can be performed by reading a barcode that expressly instructs to

delete the operation on the tour.

With respect to **dependent claim 18,** Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein performing the at

least one operation comprises storing the portion of the recorded information corresponding to

the at least one time range (See Para 73-74).

With respect to **dependent claim 19,** Rajasekaran teaches the method further comprising

receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers from a second set of

identifiers printed on the paper document (See Para 0038, 42 and 65) and

determining one or more operations based upon the one or more identifiers from the second set of identifiers and performing at least one operation from the one or more operations on portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges(See Para 0079-81)..

With respect to **dependent claim 20,** Rajasekaran teaches the wherein performing the at least one operation comprises ranking the one or more time ranges based upon contents of the portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges (See Para 0095and 0075).

With respect to **dependent claim 21,** Rajasekaran teaches the wherein ranking the one or more time ranges comprises for each time range in the one or more time ranges, determining relevance of the portion of the recorded information corresponding to the time range to a user-specified criterion (See Para 0075) and ranking the one or more time ranges based upon the relevance of the portions of the recorded information corresponding to the time ranges to the user-specified criterion (See Para 0095-0099).

With respect to **dependent claim 22,** Rajasekaran teaches the wherein the user-specified criterion identifies a topic of interest (See Para 0090). A timestamp in an index associated with a child's learning process stored on a video and linked by an annotation.

With respect to **dependent claim 23,** Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein performing the at least one operation comprises grouping the one or more time ranges into one or more groups based upon contents of the portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges (See Para 0096-0099 and 73-75).

With respect to **dependent claim 70,** as indicated in the above discussion, Rajasekaran in view of Rothschild teaches all the limitations of claim 1.

Rajasekaran does not expressly teach displaying the content corresponding to one or more time ranges, however this limitation would have been obvious in view of Rothschild, because Rothschild teaches displaying content over an elapsed time (See column 10, lines 15-67).

Claims **24-26, 33-36, 39, 41-46, 71** reflect the system comprising computer readable instruction for performing the method steps of 1-3, 10-13, 16, 18-23, 70 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims **47-49, 56-59, 62, 64-69, 72** reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instruction for performing the method steps of 1-3, 10-13, 16, 18-23 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

7.   **Claims 14, 15, 17, 37-38, 40, 60-61, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekaran et al. (hereinafter Rajasekaran) U.S. Publication No. 20030024975 filed Nov. 15, 2001, in view of Rothschild et al. (hereinafter Rothschild) U.S. Patent No. 6766363 filed Aug. 31, 2000, in further view of Wilz et al. (Hereinafter Wilz) U.S. Patent No. 6152369 filed Aug. 4, 1997.**

With respect to **dependent claims 14 and 15,** Rajasekaran in view of Rothschild teach every limitation of claim 13.

Rajasekaran in view of Rothschild does not expressly teach the method wherein communicating the portion of the recorded information corresponding to the at least one time range to the recipient comprises communicating the portion of the recorded information via an electronic mail addressed to the recipient or via facsimile. Rothschild teaches an email can be performed showing other information related to the content (See column 16, lines 1-10). However, these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention,

having the teachings of Rajasekaran, Rothschild and Wilz in front of them, to modify the system

of Rajasekaran to send the information in the database to another person via email. Rajasekaran

suggests that the information can be sent as an email attachment (See Para 0084) and Wilz

teaches a file that can be sent via email and facsimile to another user where the item is printed

and then faxed (See column 24, lines 26-67 and column 25, lines 1-21). Rajasekaran and Wilz

teach using paper mediums to store bar codes that can be scanned by a user. The bar codes

represent information that can be retrieved. Both inventions teach the bar codes comprise

information directing the user to media content and both have codes that include time values. The

motivation to combine Wilz with Rajasekaran comes from the suggestion in Wilz that the use of

bar codes can simplify the entry of commands to direct the computer to perform a process such

as entering a URL or directing the machine to send an email containing the information of interest

(See column 2, lines 30-50 and 59-67 and column 3, lines 5-15). Moreover, Wilz teaches

accessing presentations from a barcode and Rajasekaran teaches the creation of tour that is a

presentation, which is an expressed example in the art of using the teachings of Rajasekaran.

With respect to **dependent claim 17,** Rajasekaran in view of Rothschild teach every element of

claim 11.

Rajasekaran in view of Rothschild does not expressly teach the method wherein performing the

at least one operation comprises printing a representation of the portion of the recorded

information corresponding to the at least one time range on a paper medium to generate a

second paper document. However, these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Rajasekaran, Rothschild and

Wilz in front of them, to modify the system of Rajasekaran to modify the system of Rajasekaran to

perform an operation to print the representation of the information with the teachings of Wilz that

allows for barcode menus printed on paper to be selected by users scanning through a catalog or

collection of information. The codes are selected by the user that include a point in time or over a

period in time to determine which items should be within the menu under composition. Wilz

further teaches that the arranged information can be in a number of columns or pages to

encompass the information. Theses two teachings suggest that a set of items from a catalog

occurring at a point in time can be selected and arranged in a menu to be printed by the system

that can be on one or more pages of paper. (See column 18, lines 44-67 and column 23, lines 20-

67 and column 24, lines 1-25).

Claims **37-38 and 40** reflect the system comprising computer readable instruction for performing the

method steps of 14-15 and 17, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims **60-61 and 63** reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instruction for

performing the method steps of 14-15 and 17, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

6. **Claims 4-9, 27-32, 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

   Rajasekaran in view of Rothschild as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of

   Jun et al. (hereinafter Jun) U.S. Patent No. 6931594 filed Nov. 2, 2000.

With respect to **dependent claims 4-9,** as indicated in the above discussion, Rajasekaran in view

of Rothschild teaches all of claim 1.

Rajasekaran teaches the method wherein the one or more identifiers selected from the first set of

identifiers comprise a first and second identifier (See Para 0067 and 79). Rajasekaran teaches

that the user can select labels in any sequence they desire (before or after) (See Para 0078) as

the sequence is as the user browsed through the content. Rajasekaran also teaches scanning an

index after reading in a barcode for material printed on a label. The timestamp of on label can be

compared to another timestamp during the tour (See Para 0090 and 0096-0099) to determine the

sequence in which the information is presented to the user. Rajasekaran teaches that one or

more labels can be assigned to an object identifier (See Para 0074) where images and video and

audio can be linked to the same object ID. Certainly, audio and video are different types of

recorded information. Rajasekaran does not expressly teach *determining the portions of the*

recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges comprises determining a

portion of the recorded information occurring between the first time and second time associated

with the first identifier and wherein the start time of the first time range is determined by

subtracting a first amount of time from the time associated with the first identifier and an end time

of the first time range is determined by adding a second amount of time to the time associated

with the first identifier and wherein the first amount of time and the second amount of time are

user-configurable. The interpretation by the Examiner comes from the understanding that the

present application allows a user to read **a time value** from a paper object that is representative

of time ranges (See figure 24, present application). The server system would then determine the

ranges from the codes and retrieve the information as shown in (figure 24, present application).

Therefore, Rajasekaran clearly teaches reading barcodes from paper where the codes include

timestamps and an index of content can be organized by timestamp. Rothschild teaches

scanning a barcode to retrieve a given content from a barcode and teaches a process of showing

content over an elapsed time, which is a range. Rajasekaran in view of Rothschild do not teach

the user *wherein the first amount of time and the second amount of time are user-configurable.*

However these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention, in view of Jun, because Jun teaches a user configurable slider that can show a

start and end frame based on a range selected by the user. The frames are selected based on a

time code. Rajasekaran teaches the storing and accessing streaming media (See Para 110) and

Rothschild teaches reading time codes from content and Jun teaches having a user interface to

specify the time ranges to look at in the streaming media. The motivation to combine Jun with

Rajasekaran and Rothschild comes from the suggestion in Jun that to generate an index, similar

to Rajasekaran of indexed timestamps of content, a user interface allowing the user to designate

a position and time range is necessary (See column 1, lines 25-32).

Claims **27-32**, reflect the system comprising computer readable instruction for performing the method

steps of 4-9, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims **50-55**, reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instruction for

performing the method steps of 4-9, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-72 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant strongly disagrees that the prior art suggests the features of the claims

Applicant argues that Rajasekaran does not teach " determining one or more time ranges based on one

or more identifiers, each time range having a start and end time" because they do not interpret section 61

and 62 as teaching the claim features. First, it is noted that the claim recites broadly the word

"determining" which can be interpreted by the skilled artisan in a number of ways. The claims do not

specifically recite how the determination is made or the specific process of reading or determining the

time ranges to find a start and end time. In more then one instance, a mental step can be performed to

determine the time ranges by simply reading the paper. MPEP 2111 states that the Examiner may not

import from the specification limitations that are not in the claim. Second, it appears applicant argues

section 61, and 62 do not show or recite the features of the claim. Referring to the final rejection, the

Examiner also pointed to section 90, 95-96 and 99, which provides the structure as to how a timestamp

can be read by a system to determine a time range. However, no arguments were presented on those

sections of the reference. The Examiner referred to Para 67 and 79 in the first limitation, which refers to

labels that are object identifiers. The object identifiers can be timestamps. The timestamps as outlined in

Para 42, serve as qualifiers for media events. Thus, as outlined in Para 90, a tour can be a chronicled

series of events that are retrieved by the object identifiers. Two objects with a given timestamp can be

compared to retrieve the start and stop time for the purposes of moving from one event to the next. The

applicant argues claim 1, and in claim 1 the mechanism or process of receiving has not been identified

and the determination process is left to the reader to determine. The claim has been interpreted broadly

as a mechanism in Rajasekaran where timestamps are read. In this case, it appears from the arguments

that the strong disagreement, is based on only one section of the reference and does not take into

account the entire reference (See MPEP 2123 and 2144) and applicant appears to have imported the

specific teachings into the claims from the specification (See MPEP 2111). The coordinate information is

but one of the pieces of information attached to a label (See Para 49) and the circular reference refers to

one section of the tour that surrounds a given media item. While coordinates are stored in the label, the

label comprises more information including the timestamp for the media event. Without a timestamp or

reference point the chronicle idea, which is the point of the invention, is missed. Further, the string used

to store the timestamp is specifically shown in the data structure (See Para 66-67) as any data type that

can be retrieved from the label and provide one example as to how the barcode reader (method of

retrieving) reads the barcode as a string of numbers and determines from the indices how to organize the

information (See Para 66). A string of numbers can be shown as a time stamp. Para 69, shows how two

object identifiers are used under a normalized label scheme (See Para 71) that can allow different labels

to index media content (See Para 72) and with two strings showing time the system can provide the

structure to show a beginning and end time. But the specific limitation argued specifies determining the

time range. Nothing in the limitation state what is done with the determined range. Therefore, the

Examiner believes a reasonable interpretation of the prior art has been made and the claim remains

rejected. Perhaps applicant can revisit MPEP rule 1.75 to distinctly claim their invention and avoid broad terminology that can be rejected with 102/103 type rejections. Further, it is noted that applicant **has not** exercised their rights to contact the examiner to review potential limitations with the examiner prior to submitting claims, in an attempt to shorten the prosecution process. Perhaps applicant will exercise the feature in the future, as the Examiner has cited several new references that can be considered in potential rejections that are pertinent to the current claims.

Applicant argues that Rothschild does not teach a portion of a movie is determined from a time range

Applicant argues that no where in Rothschild is their suggestion that a media content time stamp is determined from the time in the other information attached to the media items in Rothschild.

The Examiner disagrees.

The examiner relied on Rothschild for one mechanism for "determining portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges, wherein a portion of recorded information corresponding to a time range comprises information from the recorded information occurring between the start time and end time associated with the time range." Rothschild teaches one method of determining the portion of recorded information from a time stamp. The time stamp in Rothschild is read by the system from the UPC, which contains time a car scene, 3-4 minutes into the movie, and then again 8-11 minutes into the movie. The code, as shown in column 8, has a specific format within the code that can be read by the system to determine, a begin (3 minutes) and end time (11 minutes) and again at 19-30 minutes. Therefore, the skilled artisan would determine that the code that is read by the system provides a mechanism to determine the time ranges correspond to content. Once again the claim broadly recites "determining" without distinctly claiming the process in the specification. Therefore, the Examiner broadly construes the limitation as one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret a "determination" process. If the system has a means that can process, decipher, read, formulate, or rationalize a mechanism for reading a code that then directs the system to retrieve content at a start and end time, based on the code, then the system must determine from the code the beginning and end time. It begs to differ that the system would process any other time period in the movie, as the user specifically wants to

see where the car scene is. Providing other information at other times in the movie simply will not due.

So, to determine the start of when the car will be seen and when it stops is an important feature in

Rothschild and is the basis for the examiners interpretation for the code disclosed in column 8. Therefore,

the claims remain rejected over the prior art.

It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re *Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re *Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5682540 to Klotz, that teaches a paper based medium where machine readable code

convey information to the user about the information on the page by accessing a computer with the

information embedded in the code. The information can be user specific information based on keywords

or information recognized from the accessed images.

U.S. Patent No. 5938727 to Ikeda, which also teaches a paper based interface that contains codes that

are read by a scanner and direct a user to access the media on a computer.

U.S. Patent No. 6996782 to Parker et al, that teaches indexing multimedia object and retrieving them

based on a time range.

U.S. Patent No. 5899700 to Williams et al, that teaches a system of reading encoded information from a

paper medium

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven B Theriault/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2179